

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/068,229	BRIST ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Ishwar (I. B.) Patel	2827	

All Participants:

(1) Ishwar (I. B.) Patel.

(2) Tom Van Zandt (43,219).

Date of Interview: 4 November 2003

Type of Interview:

☒ Telephonic

☐ Video Conference

☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

Claims discussed:

21

Prior art documents discussed:

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.

☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

Status of Application: Being allowed

(3) _____

(4) _____

Time: 6:10 PM

IB Patel

(Examiner/SPE Signature)

 (Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Called the applicant as the application was in allowable condition except the issues as discussed. The structure of the newly added claim 21 was not clear and was not shown in the figures to be able to implement the claimed structure. Also cross-hatching pattern for the base layer was not incorporated in the figures and rejection of figure 7A and 7A, as shown in the previous action was not addressed. Applicant gave permission to carryout the respective changes by examiner's amendment.